

September 22, 1965

CPYRGHT

becomes legally incompetent and loses his rights when he is committed to a hospital for treatment."

Attorneys should also be made aware of the Senator's cosponsorship of a bill to authorize all attorneys, licensed in their home State, to practice before administrative agencies without separate admission by the agency involved.

Neither the last nor the least of his zealous pursuit of the means to safeguard individual liberties is his current inquiry into Federal employees rights in firings, hirings, and personnel practices.

Of this dedicated lawyer, jurist, legislator, and patriot it can truly be said he is an example of the fulfillment of the late President Kennedy's admonition to us all, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what can you do for your country."

THE RECENT CIVIL DISTURBANCES IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, much has been written and said about the recent violent disturbances in Los Angeles, but I think nowhere have such unfortunate occurrences been put in better perspective than they were in a statement of Prince Hall Grand Masters, made in San Francisco, Calif., in August 1965.

Amos T. Hall, a good friend and a good man, has relayed this statement to me.

Believing that it will be of interest to all Senators, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PRINCE HALL GRAND MASTERS, AUGUST 1965, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Prince Hall Masonry with a membership of approximately one-half million, reaffirms its historical position of protest in seeking to eliminate the inequities of citizenship and every form of discrimination from the American scene.

We deplore the recent violent disturbances which have resulted in the loss of lives and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property in cities of the United States without regard to sectional location.

We direct attention to the courageous leadership of President Johnson, which has resulted in the enactment of advanced civil rights legislation by the Congress of the United States and to his expressions and proclamations regarding the public acceptance of the fact that all citizens of our Nation are entitled to, and should have, equal protection and application of the law, irrespective of their race, color, or religious affiliations.

We call upon every Prince Hall Mason as a leader in his community to use his influence to keep this protest nonviolent as he strives to eliminate injustice and discrimination. We urge that violence be avoided and solutions sought within the framework of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

AQUILA QUARRY REVISITED

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the attached editorial from the Richmond News Leader of September 21, 1965, entitled "Aquila Quarry Revisited."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Sept. 21, 1965]

AQUILA QUARRY REVISITED

Last week we reported on the strange tactics of those who were asserting that George Washington, the Father of his Country, was a common crooked politician. The story was that he had finessed a little deal to gyp the Federal Government by selling second-rate Aquila stone for building the U.S. Capitol. But ever-alert researchers up at Mount Vernon had quickly shown from letters that Washington never owned the quarry at Aquila Creek; and that in fact the Federal Government bought the quarry outright from other owners and cut the stone itself.

Today the mail brings to hand a year-old issue of Lawyers Title News, giving a complete history of the ownership of the Aquila quarry—and its confused tangle of titles. The article backs up the Mount Vernon research with the expert legal scholarship of an associate counsel for Lawyers Title Insurance Co., Marvin C. Bowling, Jr. It's clear from Mr. Bowling's study that Washington had nothing to do with the quarry.

Lawyers Title got into the problem a couple of years ago, when after a routine search, it insured a seemingly perfect title to the island where the quarry is located. The abstract showed an unbroken title running back to the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1877. At that time, the State had granted the island to two individuals on a land office warrant. The overgrown quarry which provided stone for the U.S. Capitol and the White House was forgotten and undetected. Then one day the new, 20th century owner discovered signs on the island warning: "U.S. Government property—keep off." Soon an official advertisement appeared indicating that the land would be sold by the General Services Administration at public auction.

The supposed owner grew alarmed. Lawyers Title was appalled. After running down a number of U.S. Government agencies that handle property, Mr. Bowling finally found the right one. Yes, they had a title, officials explained; it went straight back to Charles II, and the U.S. Government had the paper to prove it.

In 1678, the island was granted by the "Governor and Captain General of Virginia" to two individuals who had performed services for the King. The next instrument, dated 1694, stated that the first grant was void; the new instrument transferred the land to a George Brent. And the grantors were the successors to the original proprietors, the successors being Margaret Lady Culpeper, Thomas Lord Fairfax, Catherine, his wife, and Alexander Culpeper, Esq. Thus the interest in the property went back all the way to the original grant of the entire Northern Neck to the Culpepers in 1669. For upon the death of Lord Culpeper, his interest became vested in his daughter Catherine, wife of Lord Fairfax. The family then sold to Brent.

The property remained in the Brent family, famous Catholic recusants from Maryland, for 97 years. In 1791, another George Brent conveyed the island to Peter Charles L'Enfant—the man who laid out the terrifying complexity of Washington streets—for 1,800 pounds. The title was confirmed in the name of the trustees for the commissioners appointed to establish a "seat of government of the United States." The stone was cut, the Capitol built, the quarry abandoned, and the very ownership of the island forgotten. Many records in the Stafford County courthouse were destroyed by Union soldiers. And in 1877, the State of Virginia, blissfully unaware that it possessed no right to the land, granted it anew.

Through the peculiar precedence of royal and Federal sovereignty, Lawyers Title's client lost the land, and was left with the proceeds of the title insurance. Eventually the GSA disposed of the historical plot of

land as surplus. Despite the complexity of the ownership of the quarry, it is evident that George Washington's detractors have no title to their false claim.

PLIGHT OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 19, American Jews assembled in Lafayette Park across from the White House to call world attention to the plight of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

The Jews of that country are subjected to discrimination. Like other peoples in the Soviet Union, they are regarded as a nationality group. They are named as Jews on their passports. But they are not permitted the rights accorded to other nationalities. Their schools, their theater, their culture, their books, their learning, their newspapers—all these have disappeared. For almost half a century, ever since the Soviet revolution of 1917, this great community, which was once a reservoir of learning for world Jewry, has been cut away and isolated from Jews of other lands, from its own historic pact. Gradually, but inexorably, it will be cut away from its identity and it will cease to exist.

Officials of our own country are aware of this injustice and have joined with the American Jewish community in appeals to the Soviet Union for a rectification of this wrong. Our own body has spoken twice on this subject during the last 2 years and, during the last few months, President Lyndon B. Johnson has twice expressed his own views publicly.

Last Sunday, on September 19, as Jews began a vigil in Lafayette Park to attest their concern and to protest against the gradual disappearance of the Jewish people of the Soviet Union, the President addressed a message to that demonstration, and I ask unanimous consent that the President's message be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1965.

I greet my fellow Americans of all faiths gathered today in a vigil for Soviet Jewry. Your cause is the cause of all men who value freedom.

History demonstrates that the treatment of minorities is a barometer by which to measure the moral health of a society. Just as the condition of the American Jew is a living symbol of American achievement and promise, so the conditions of Jewish life and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union reveal fundamental contradictions between the stated principles and the actual practices of the Soviet system.

I once again express my hope for an end to the restrictive practices which prevent Soviet Jews from the full enjoyment of their heritage. I join all men everywhere who through vigilance maintain freedom's eternal light.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and the Chair lays

CPYRGHT
T

23852

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 22, 1965

before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD, a statement prepared by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

There can be little doubt that the pending immigration bill is not nearly so objectionable as it was when it was first introduced as an administration measure at the beginning of the year. However, I remain opposed to its enactment because I do not believe that in the long run it will promote the general welfare of the United States. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that if we enact this proposed legislation, we will be adding unnecessary weight to the burdens that will have to be borne by future generations of Americans.

A number of basic changes were made in the bill before it was passed by the House of Representatives. These changes, along with other additional amendments made by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, have made it an entirely different measure from the one that was recommended in the President's January 13 message to Congress. The bill's provisions regarding basic changes in the quota system were drastically altered. The provisions for a Presidential commission, which would eventually have been responsible for formulating immigration policy, I am glad to say, have been deleted. Stronger controls against immigration that would displace American workers from their jobs and adversely affect wages and working conditions in this country have been incorporated into the bill. These are noteworthy improvements, but they do not, in my opinion, justify the bill's enactment.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

Under the provisions of this bill, the volume of immigration into this country would be bound to significantly increase. The estimates that have been made concerning the size of this increase vary from 60,000 to 100,000 or more. Considering that an average of 300,000 immigrants have been admitted annually in recent years, this means that we will have upwards of 400,000 immigrants a year under the bill.

I do not believe that it is wise for us to be increasing immigration at the present time. Notwithstanding its provisions, which are supposed to safeguard domestic workers, this bill will increase the size of our labor force, both immediately and even more markedly in the years ahead when the younger immigrants and the offspring of those admitted reach working age.

Moreover, I am not at all assured that the intended safeguards of workers in this country will prove effective with respect to the immigrant to whom they are intended to apply. Frankly, I see nothing but a tremendous bureaucratic nightmare in attempting to put these provisions into effect. Under the bill, a job clearance would be required for each individual applicant for an immigration visa, stating that the applicant will not displace a qualified American worker or have any adverse effect on wages and working conditions of domestic workers. The job clearance would be required for every immigrant except those granted preference under the bill by reason of their relationship to a

U.S. citizen or an alien admitted for permanent residence.

The enactment of these provisions would, in my opinion, cast an impossible burden upon the Labor Department if it is to administer them effectively. Imagine, if we will, the involved decisions that would have to be made in applying these restrictions to thousands upon thousands of prospective immigrants each year. In my opinion, the provisions are utterly unworkable and give every indication of being inserted in the bill merely to provide an answer to those who would raise questions concerning the bill's effects on our labor market.

Each generation of Americans has a responsibility to those that will follow after it. That responsibility is now ours, to leave our children and their children a country in which to live which will be free of any difficulties or problems of our making that we ourselves would not want to face.

I firmly believe that if we enact this proposed legislation increasing immigration, we will be abdicating this responsibility for the shortsighted and transient goals of political expediency. Many of the social and economic problems we face today may well be inconsequential in comparison to those of future generations with our vastly expanding populations.

Certainly, it is impossible to say at what precise point a country becomes overpopulated. This does not mean, however, that we cannot clearly recognize when we are faced with population problems. I believe we are facing them now. We have reached a point when our water resources are being taxed severely in order to meet present needs in many parts of the country, for example. Many of our rivers and streams have become polluted to the degree that they no longer afford the recreational facilities, or meet the needs for modest and industrial water consumption that they did just a few years ago. One of the Great Lakes, we are told, is now in the process of dying from such pollution. New York and other cities in New England and Middle Atlantic States are now experiencing the serious problems that arise from lack of clean, fresh water. Water problems are numerous in my area of the country. In the face of such problems like these, and others, I feel that we must move most cautiously in considering legislation which would add stimulus to the pace of our population growth.

There are several provisions of the bill which I would support, but not at the expense of increasing the volume of immigration, which would be the major effect of its enactment. I strongly support, for example, the abolishment of the Asia-Pacific triangle which has been especially discriminatory. I also lend my support to the committee amendment to the bill providing a numerical limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration. I do not view this amendment as an affront to our Western Hemisphere neighbors. I doubt that in their mature judgment they would view it as such either. The family reunification and skill requirement provisions of the bill are most meritorious.

It is evident that the national origins quota system has in some ways been discriminatory, and that it has not always worked as it was intended to. These claims, of course, have some merit, but that does not justify enactment, in my opinion, of legislation to greatly increase the numbers of immigrants that will be admitted into the country. Certainly, it is possible to reform the basic law without increasing immigration. That is what I would prefer to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, just 4 years ago today on September 22, 1961, President John F. Kennedy approved Public Law 87-293, the Peace Corps Act. This historic measure, which was enacted with overwhelming Democratic and Republican support in both Houses of Congress, has continued to justify the hopes and the dreams of those who gave it their faith.

Peace Corps volunteers are now located in 46 countries. At the end of the 1964 program year the Peace Corps had 10,494 volunteers and trainees in service. At the end of the August 31, 1965, program year, the Peace Corps had 12,000 volunteers and trainees in service. Legislation recently approved by Congress will authorize 15,110 volunteers and trainees by August 31, 1966. An overwhelming number of these trainees are devoting themselves to education. Others are helping in community action, agriculture, and health among others.

The example they have set by personal conduct has truly demonstrated that Americans are a helpful and compassionate people. The spirit of 1776 as exemplified in the Declaration of Independence called upon our people "to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitled them." That declaration held the following truths to be self-evident that:

All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Peace Corps volunteers have sought to bring this hope of 1776 to the developing nations of 1965. And they are succeeding. In Afghanistan when the Peace Corps first went to help the people there they were limited to 15 volunteers—9 actually went—located only in the capital city of Kabul. We now have 190 Peace Corps volunteers there serving in many parts of that land. In Colombia Peace Corps volunteers are producing educational television programs which are bringing the benefits of education and culture to many people of that land.

The projects are innumerable and worthwhile, but it is the spirit and representations which these Americans, men and women, young and old, make for a free way of life that is most meaningful. They do not live in Embassy compounds. They do not shop at the PX. They live with the people. They eat their food. They share their life as they work to understand and help them help themselves.

When the Peace Corps started with the verve and enthusiasm which it combined, many Washington cynics thought that it would not be long before the Peace